# NC

## General Shell

Text: Developing countries should engage in prior binding consultation with indigenous peoples affected by resource extraction on whether environmental protection should be prioritized over resource extraction when the two conflict.

It’s mutually exclusive. If we were consulting we wouldn’t be firmly determined, and “Resolved” implies a firm determination.

**Random House 10** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

**[Definition of] re•solved** (rɪˈzɒlvd) adj. **firm in purpose or intent; determined.** [1490–1500] re•solv′ed•ly, adv. re•solv′ed•ness, n.

There are multiple barriers to prior consultation of indigenous people now. The impact is social conflicts which kill democracy and stability.

**Oxfam 11** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

In the context of their work in Latin America, **the E**xtractive **I**ndustries **P**rogram of the international confederation Oxfam **and** the **D**ue **P**rocess of **L**aw **F**oundation (DPLF) have observed a **substantial increase in** the number and intensity of **social conflicts**, **which threaten democratic governance and stability** in several countries. While the causes of these conflicts vary, **a significant proportion** of them—and probably the most prominent—**are associated with** natural resources management and with **resource exploitation** and infrastructure projects. **These conflicts**, which are a **reflect**ion of latent **tensions between** the stakeholders, pit two **divergent views of development** against one another. On the one hand, **States seek to encourage private investment** with a view to promoting development in accordance with the relevant constitutional norms. On the other hand, **indigenous peoples are asserting their rights to** use and **enjoy their lands and** to **protect** and manage **them according to their own worldview**, safeguarded by the constitution. **These** types of social **conflicts are increasingly common** and become particularly heated **when** natural **resource extraction** and infrastructure **projects are undertaken without adequate prior consultation** with the indigenous or tribal communities that could be affected, or without the free, prior, and informed consent of those communities where required. At the heart of disputes over land and natural resources, then, is the debate over the content and scope of the right to prior consultation and to free, prior, and informed consent. In this context, Oxfam and DPLF have undertaken to disseminate information about the relevant international legal framework and related developments in international legal systems such as the United Nations, the International Labour Organization (ILO), and the inter-American system for the promotion and protection of human rights. State and governmental bodies, civil society organizations, and the communities themselves must take these international rules and decisions into account in framing discussion of these issues. Given the extent to which social protest relies on institutional mechanisms, including legal mechanisms, Oxfam and DPLF would like to encourage their use in addressing these types of conflicts in the domestic and international arenas. Toward this end, both organizations are concerned with reducing the practical obstacles to enjoyment of the right to prior consultation and to free, prior, and informed consent that have been encountered in different countries in the region. The Andean region has both abundant natural wealth and a large number of indigenous, tribal, and peasant communities or nationalities. Actions to date have largely proven ineffective in resolving the resource-related social conflicts that have threatened, and continue to threaten, democratic governance in the region. There is a clear need to explore other means of ensuring that extractive and infrastructure projects are compatible with effective protection of the rights of indigenous and tribal peoples and their surrounding environment. Approached from this standpoint, natural resource extraction on lands inhabited by indigenous peoples could play a pivotal role in the socioeconomic development of these territories and populations, who suffer persistent poverty, marginalization, and social exclusion despite the progress made with respect to constitutional and legal recognition of their rights. More often than not, however, **indigenous peoples** in the Andean region come up against projects that are either already underway or about to be implemented on their lands, with no prior notice or consultation whatsoever. They **frequently are stymied in their attempts to obtain info**rmation **about a particular project** and its possible consequences, or about the company involved. These **difficulties are compounded by language barriers and** by **unfamiliarity with** the **legal remedies that could protect their rights**, leaving them unable to take a meaningful role in decision-making processes affecting their lands. To make matters worse, **longstanding delays in** the **legal recognition**, titling, and demarcation **of their lands has left many indigenous peoples** extremely **vulnerable** and impotent **in dealing with their own governments, as well as with t**rans**n**ational **c**ompanie**s** that enter their territories with government-backed concession contracts in hand.

Indigenous people would say yes and consultation is key to respecting their cultural diversity. **SUNS 11** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

An important cross-section of indigenous peoples, Governments and companies noted that **affected indigenous peoples need**ed **to be consulted about and** be **involved in** the **operation of** natural **resource extraction projects** that affect them. This need was identified, depending on the identity of the respondent, as both a right affirmed in international and domestic law and a matter of pragmatism: a preventative measure to avoid project opposition and social conflicts that could result in the disruption of project operations, says the report. Representatives of business enterprises reported that deficient domestic regulatory frameworks create barriers to carrying out their operations in a way that respects indigenous peoples' rights and interests. According to the report, corporate responses point out **three** particular **areas in which a clear regulatory framework is** often **lacking:** the content and scope of indigenous peoples' **rights over** their **lands, territories and** natural **resources**, particularly in those instances in which traditional land tenure has not been officially recognized through titling or otherwise; **consultation procedures** with indigenous peoples; **and benefit-sharing schemes**. With regard to these issues, the examples of best practices shared by companies related more to their voluntary practices and initiatives than to the meeting of the legal requirements of the countries in which they operate, said the Special Rapporteur. "Contrasting perspectives exist over the benefits of extractive operations. Various Governments and companies identified benefits to indigenous peoples resulting from natural resource extraction projects, while, in general, indigenous peoples and organizations reported that benefits were limited in scope and did not make up for the problems associated with these projects." Several Governments highlighted the key importance of natural resource extraction projects for their domestic economies that, in a number of countries, reportedly account for up to 60 to 70 per cent of GNP. Governments also indicated that extractive projects have positive benefits for indigenous peoples and others in the regions where they operate. Responses highlighted the fact that significant proportions of State royalties and other revenues from extractive operations are assigned to regional or local government structures (as indicated in the response from Peru), to regional development funds (for example, in the Ecuadorian Amazon region) or, more exceptionally, to indigenous organizations (for example, in Bolivia). Job opportunities were also commonly cited as a direct benefit derived from extractive operations in indigenous territories. Yet, says the report, **contrasting perspectives** with regard to benefits **reflect different cultural orientations** within the development context. **Most indigenous peoples** and organization responses **underscored** the adverse effects on **their environment**, culture and societies, **which they said outweighed** the minimal or **short-term benefits arising out of extractive operations**. In this connection, **a member of the Pemon** people **of Venezuela reported that benefits from extractive industries were not a top priority within the community; rather, the group sought "**healthy communities, with no infections, in **a pollution-free environment**". Similarly, an organization representing the traditional authorities of the Cofan people of Colombia concluded that, in present circumstances, "indigenous peoples are left with no option other than to try to find something positive for their communities out of the disaster left behind by the extraction of oil, mineral, and other resources" in their traditional territories. In his overall preliminary assessment, the Special Rapporteur said that the various points of view communicated by indigenous peoples, Governments, business enterprises and other relevant stakeholders concerning natural resource and energy extractive development projects in indigenous territories reveal that, despite a growing awareness of the need to respect the rights of indigenous peoples as an integral part of those projects, many problems remain. The responses to the questionnaire confirm the Special Rapporteur's perception, derived from the various activities carried out during the first three years of his mandate, that the **implementation of** natural **resource extraction** and other development projects **on or near indigenous territories has become one of the foremost concerns of indigenous peoples worldwide**, and possibly also the most pervasive source of the challenges to the full exercise of their rights. The growing awareness of the actual or potential negative impact of industry operations on the rights of indigenous peoples is further marked by an increasing number of legal regulations and other Government initiatives, as well as by enhanced action by domestic courts and human rights institutions, which were cited in the responses to the Special Rapporteur's questionnaire. Furthermore, this growing awareness is evident in the development or strengthening by business enterprises of internal human rights safeguards and even of specific indigenous rights policies. Despite this growing level of awareness, however, the responses to the Special Rapporteur's questionnaire also show the lack of a minimum shared understanding about the basic implications of accepted international standards or about the institutional arrangements and methodologies required to give them full effect in the context of extractive or development operations that may affect indigenous peoples. In this connection, says the report, differing or vague understandings persist about the scope and content of indigenous peoples' rights and about the degree and nature of the responsibility of the State to ensure the protection of these rights in the context of extractive industries. An additional, significant area of divergent perspectives concerns the balance between costs and benefits of extractive development projects. Even though there is a shared awareness of the past negative effects of extractive activities for indigenous peoples, there are widely divergent perspectives about the incidence and value of benefits from extractive industries, especially into the future. The Special Rapporteur said that many of the Governments' responses to the questionnaire underscored the key importance of extractive industries for their domestic economies. Many of the responses by **business actors shared the view that indigenous peoples could** stand to **benefit from extractive industries.** For their part, **indigenous peoples' responses to the** Special **Rapporteur's questionnaire were dominated by** a great deal of scepticism and, in many cases, **outright rejection**, **of the possibility of benefiting** from extractive or development projects in their traditional territories. The vast majority of **indigenous peoples' responses, many of which stemmed from** the **direct experience** of specific projects affecting their territories and communities, rather **emphasized** a **common** perception of disenfranchisement, **ignorance of their rights and concerns** on the part of States and business enterprises, and constant life insecurity in the face of encroaching extractive activities. "Such a perception suggests that no apparent positive impact is to be had from these operations, which are seen more as a top-down imposition of decisions taken in a collusion of State and corporate interests than the result of negotiated decisions in which their communities are not directly involved." In the Special Rapporteur's view, the **lack of** a **minimum common ground** for understanding the key issues by all actors concerned **entails a major barrier for** the **effective protection** and realization **of indigenous peoples' rights** in the context of extractive development projects. According to the report, the responses to the Special Rapporteur's questionnaire manifest the need for change in the current state of affairs if indigenous rights standards are to have a meaningful effect on State and corporate policies and action as they relate to indigenous peoples. An initial step towards such a change is establishing a common ground of understanding among indigenous peoples, governmental actors, business enterprises and other relevant actors. The Special Rapporteur believed that an effective way to advance in the fulfilment of his mandate during the years ahead is to focus on the elaboration of a set of guidelines or principles that will provide specific orientation to Governments, indigenous peoples and corporations regarding the protection of indigenous rights in the context of resource extraction or development projects. While the existing problems and challenges ahead are significant and complex, the Special Rapporteur said that he is encouraged by what he perceives to be a growing degree of awareness and assumption of responsibility on the part of States and corporate actors. "This growing awareness opens a historical opportunity for advancing towards a common normative understanding and the operationalization of indigenous peoples' rights and related institutional safeguards in the context of natural resource extraction and development projects in indigenous territories," he concluded.

Indigenous people are key to global cultural diversity and indigenous culture is key to sustainable development.

**UN no date** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

**Indigenous peoples** currently **number** some **350 million** individuals **in more than 70 countries** in the world **and represent more than 5000 languages and cultures. Despite their important contribution to** the **world cultural diversity and** to the **sustainable development** of our planet**, many of them live on the fringes of society and are deprived of** basic **human rights**. Through its partnership with indigenous peoples, UNESCO seeks to support them in addressing the multiple challenges they face, while acknowledging their significant role in the world’s cultural landscape. **UNESCO’s activities** with indigenous peoples are framed by its missions to protect and promote cultural diversity, **encourage intercultural dialogue and** enhance **linkages between culture and development.** The organization is thus actively involved in implementing the Second International Decade of the World’s Indigenous People (2005-2014) which is intended to strengthen international cooperation for the solution of problems faced by indigenous peoples in such areas as human rights, the environment, development, education and health, building on efforts initiated during the First Decade (1995-2004). The adoption of the Second Decade reflects increasing awareness of the precarious condition of indigenous peoples and strengthened collaboration between indigenous organizations, governments, NGOs and UN agencies. This international mobilization has entailed significant advances such as the adoption in September 2007 of the UN Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples by the UN General Assembly, which the UNESCO Director General welcomed as a "milestone for indigenous peoples and all those who are committed to the protection and promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue". Despite these advances, **indigenous peoples remain particularly vulnerable to** the impacts of **globalisation and climate change. Often victims of displacements, dispossession of** their **lands, or lack of access to** basic **social services, it has become** increasingly **difficult for them to transmit their distinctive knowledge**, values and ways of life **from one generation to the next. Through their spiritual relationship to the land and** their **holistic worldviews, indigenous peoples offer a valuable pathway** in the search **for global** visions of **sustainable development.** UNESCO’s Medium-Term Strategy (2008-13), while mentioning indigenous peoples amongst the most vulnerable segments of society whose needs are to be prioritized, is also committed to enhance awareness about the important cultural contribution of indigenous peoples to sustainable development.

Cultural diversity solves extinction.

**Barsh 93** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

There no longer seems to be much difference in the Westernization of the Third World and of the indigenous world. Indigenous societies are usually more isolated geographically, so the process of convergence is understandably slower. But they are catching up. While world leaders lament the loss of biological diversity, which holds the key to the renewal and survival of ecosystems, **our planet rapidly is losing** its **cultural diversity, which holds the key to** the renewal and survival of **human societies**. Scientists and scholars search for an alternative in their theories while real alternative cultures disappear. **It will be a** real **struggle to reassert an indigenous perspective on social justice, democracy, and environmental security. The hardest part** of the struggle **will be** converting words to action, **going beyond** the familiar, empty rhetoric of **sovereignty and cultural superiority**. The struggle will be hardest here in the United States, where the gaps between rhetoric and reality have grown greater than anywhere on earth. This is the best place to begin, however, because this is the illusory "demonstration" that is studied by the rest of the world, including the indigenous peoples of other regions. Are American Indians ready to accept this global responsibility? The current generation of tribal leadership appears unwilling to try. It is firmly committed by its actions to the materialist path, and it is neutralized by its dependence on a continuing financial relationship with the national government and developers. The next generation of American Indians may be another matter. Disillusioned and critical, they may yet find a voice of their own that is both modern and truly indigenous, and they may have the courage to practice the ideals that their parents merely sloganize. Let us hope so. **There is no alternative** for Indian survival or **for global survival.**

## ILaw NB

Indigenous consent is key to the right to self-determination which is recognized by ILaw. **Ward 11** writes[[6]](#footnote-6)

For indigenous rights advocates, free, prior, and informed consent (FPIC) and other participation rights are derived from **the right to self-determination,** which **is considered** to be **the founding principle of indigenous** peoples’ **rights**. Given the fact that the concept of selfdetermination has historically been connected to the process of decolonisation and the secession of peoples from States, the development of an effective legal argument for indigenous peoples’ rights to self-determination has been challenging within international law.3 However, **modern conceptions of self-determination**, particularly for indigenous peoples, **do not necessarily include the right to separate from a State, but** rather **“**a range of alternatives including **the right to participate in** the **governance of the State as well as** the right to various forms of autonomy and **self-governance.”**4 ¶5 Scholars argue that **the right to self-determination is** clearly **articulated in** Common Article 1 of both **the** International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (**ICCPR**) **and** the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (**ICESCR**), which states that: “[a]ll peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.”5 As such, groups or communities of indigenous peoples, as peoples, have the right to self-determination.6 It is further argued that in order to be meaningful, **self-determination must include economic self-determination, which** ultimately **involves** the **control over traditional lands**, territories **and resources. As an extension** of these rights**, indigenous peoples must have the right to** grant or withhold **consent to** certain **development projects within their lands**, and **which impact their resources**.8

# Frontlines

## AT Perm: Non-Binding Consultation

Non-binding consultation fails to give the indigenous community a voice. Governments and corporations will take advantage of a non-binding process.

**Saavedra 11** writes[[7]](#footnote-7)

In Ecuador, the right to informed and prior consultation before the implementation of governmental or private programs in communal lands is a source of constant protests, some of which achieve their goals; but most end up embroiled in complex legal processes which benefitted the state, or companies acting with the state’s consent. Already in 1998, the indigenous peoples’ right to be consulted before any interventions by government programs in their territories was incorporated into the Constitution. That same year the International Labour Organization’s Convention 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples was ratified, incorporating into Ecuadorian jurisprudence the rights of indigenous peoples as specified in this convention. While the 1998 constitutional declaration on prior consultation was also embodied in the 2008 Constitution, it did not signal a real effect on policy. On the contrary, the statement itself was a source of conflicts within the Constituent Assembly, causing the first fissures among factions that in 2006 supported the election of President Rafael Correa. The **indigenous leader** Monica **Chuji**, who **chaired the Natural Resources Board** in the Constituent Assembly **that drafted the** 20**08** Constitution, remembers the first confrontation that occurred within the ruling party’s assembly members. **“Those of us** who were **linked to the indigenous population demanded that the Constitution establish** the requirement **that indigenous peoples give their consent** before implementing government programs in their territories, **and not merely be consulted,” said Chuji**. The confrontation of concepts, at first glance, was a response to what had been happening with the 1998 Constitution, which provided for prior consultation as the only requirement before intervention in indigenous territories. But little to nothing of value resulted from these consultations, since community decisions were not taken into account. **Governments and companies interested in extracting resources** from indigenous lands essentially **resorted to** a number of **ruses to ensure that they complied** with the requirement **within prior consultation. One** of the most used **was** to call **community assemblies in which they were informed about** the **upcoming plans, but at no time were they asked if they accepted** – or not – **the proposed plans**. “To convene a meeting of the community, or to call together certain leaders, to inform them about government plans is not a consultation, since there was no opportunity for the community to express their agreement or disagreement with the proposal; this we demand that the Constitution speak of prior consent”, said Chuji. **Prior informed consent implies that the community agrees with the intervention** in its lands**. This** in turn **requires that the outcome of the prior consultation be binding**. Neither consent nor the requirement to comply with the outcome of any prior consultation was incorporated into the 2008 Constitution.

## AT Perm: Ex Post Facto Consultation

Crimea proves. Prior consultation is better since it’s key to avoiding potential alienation of affected populations.

## Consult CPs Good

Counter interpretation: Neg may read one consult counterplan with a topic specific solvency advocate.

1. Lit solves abuse. (a) Proves you can research it, (b) proves it’s core topic education.

2. Generic counterplans are key to check back prep skew from unpredictable plans. This topic literally has thousands of them – look at the wiki. Outweighs his abuse because I wouldn’t be able to engage the aff in the first place.

3. Colonialism. The net benefit proves it’s important to discuss indigenous opinions, and their interp precludes that discourse, which means my interp is key to the most important form of education in this round.

Failure to allow discussion of marginalized voices is also an independent reason to vote neg.

**Smith 13** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

**A development topic should be one of the best opportunities to learn about difference, but** if **debaters** are going to **continue to reduce** both **the topic** and the debate space **to a** comfortable **Western discussion of people who don’t have our geographic** or national **privilege, without including their voices** or concerns **on both sides** of the topic, that should be up for discussion as well. No matter how wonderful your team’s interpretation of the topic is it doesn’t preclude linking that to the currents state of debate to shed light on the issues of **power, privilege, and identity**. They **are already part of the conversation so we should** both allow and **encourage students to confront** the apparatuses of **power** as they reveal themselves **by engaging in radical speech acts** that can expand our conception of what an argument even is. It is easy to get caught in the mold of debate, to be seduced by the wins, and to aim to reproduce arguments that are in “vogue”, however that isn’t a model of engagement that has changed anyone’s heart or mind. Debate has become so insular that **when we say advocacy skills and education we forget that those are just buzz words absent a willingness to turn politics into action.** Proponents of accessible debate invested in critical education should start to think of their politics as a question of praxis. Debate’s **static notions of what it means to be topical** (**or even political** for that matter) **will fail students unless they can** be allowed to **grapple with** those **issues that are literally right in front of them.** When I say “Activist model” I really mean that we should make room for students to practice the skills needed to activate their politics in the real world. **Assumptions, performances, and discourses should be voting issue** whether they indict the topic, an opponent, or even the debate community itself. Advocates who practice by allowing their contemporaries to garble the names of African nations, trade their stories and bodies like poker chips, and marginalize their voices in the process aren’t individuals I ever want advocating on my behalf. Portable skills start with how the activist chooses to engage in topical discussion or discussions of the topic, but their vision of a more accessible debate space itself. When competitors get settled into a room and ask me what I want to see for the next 45 minutes I tell them that it’s not my job to tell them. I don’t really care if they sit, stand, backflip, recite poems, or spread cards in and between every speech because LD isn’t my activity anymore, it’s theirs. My only job is to render a decision and remain invested and responsible for what norms I endorse for debate.

4. Consult’s key to participation and VTL – outweighs fairness and education.

**Ghavi 7** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

Before I get to the more substantive arguments here, let me just say that as much as you hate **consultation counterplans, I love them. And I mean love.** Dur**in**g my **college** career **there were a lot of times that I didn't like debate very much, and** to be quite frank, **Consult Japan made me love the activity again because it was fun.** While my experience is admittedly rare and the extreme, the point remains: if **people enjoy consult**ation counterplans **and [consult] causes them to participate in the activity more**, then this is a benefit of the counterplan that should be considered. I particularly think that if there are debaters that enjoy the counterplan, **that should be** enough to have **a VERY STRONG bias against** judges taking **measures to reign in those arguments.**

5. Consult’s key to education. Prefer carded evidence – it’s most objective.

**Ghavi 7** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

This seems to be the brunt of your argument and also the most ridiculous. I'll first note that **many accepted debate arguments are similar in terms of education.** I'll go with the **politics** example again. It's a stock negative strategy that **is often a crutch for** 2N's that requires **non-topic** related **research.** You'll say that at least they have to do research before the tournament, but **good consultation debaters will do** the same (**uniqueness updates, say yes updates**) **and I don't think that research for the sake of research is a good standard** by which we exclude or include arguments in the community. Politics disads are only specific to the aff via their link argument, just like consult counterplans are specific to affs with their say yes evidence.

**It is short-sighted to argue that these debaters will ignore the topic completely. No one reads one-off consultation counterplans.** You have to have a strategy outside of the 90 seconds it takes to read you Mochizuki cards.

Granted it's not the same, but there is also much to learn from reading consultation counterplans, and indeed I feel that I have. **In my research I have become educated on Japan's population, political structure, extended deterrence, military alliances, etc.** Also a benefit that people might not realize is that when **looking for say yes evidence** it **requires you to delve into the policy specifics of affirmatives**, giving you a detailed look at what the affs are all about.

### Edu Defense

No impact to education.

**Ghavi 7** writes[[11]](#footnote-11)

And **let's get rid of the blinders and make one thing perfectly clear** about debate: **people are there to win. How many times to you remember** walking into a round, **seeing your opponent and thinking "gee, I** really **I hope I** get to **learn something new in this debate!" Highly unlikely**, I think most debaters are busy thinking about how they are going to beat their opponent into submission. **This education business smacks of a convenient ruse to eliminate an argument that you just don't care for.**
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